

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-10, 12-21, 23 and 24 are all the claims pending in the application. In the previous Amendment, the features of claims 11 and 22 were incorporated into independent claims 1, 6, 12, 17, 23, and 24, and claims 11 and 22 were canceled. Claims 11 and 22 were previously rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Hwang (WO 00/74275) in view of Uchida (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2001/0055973). Uchida is no longer applied as a secondary reference, however the Examiner now applies Jokinen (US Patent NO. 6,266,330) as a secondary reference instead of Uchida. Specifically, claims 1, 2, 4, 6, 7, 12, 13, 15, 17, 18, 20, 21, and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Hwang in view of Jokinen. Claims 3, 10, 14, and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Hwang and Jokinen in view of Rune (US Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0012173). Claims 5, 8, 16, and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Hwang and Jokinen in view of Bluetooth specification (XP-002214950). Finally, claims 9 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Hwang and Jokinen in view of Rinchiuso (US Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0090004).

**§103(a) Rejections (Hwang / Jokinen) - Claims 1, 2, 4, 6, 7, 12, 13, 15, 17, 18, 21, and 24**

The Examiner rejects claims 1, 2, 4, 6, 7, 12, 13, 15, 17, 18, 21, and 24 essentially based on the same reasons set forth in the previous Office Action.

With respect to claim 1, Applicant maintains the same arguments as set forth in our Response dated August 18, 2005. Further, with respect to independent claim 1, Applicant submits that Jokinen, which allegedly makes up for the deficiencies of Hwang, does not disclose or suggest at least, “wherein, when the counterpart wireless communication apparatus receives the data through only one channel, the controller transmits the data through a basic channel,” as recited in amended claim 1. That is, Jokinen does not disclose or suggest a determination of whether a counterpart wireless communication apparatus receives data through only one channel. Furthermore, nowhere does Jokinen disclose or suggest that the controller transmits the data through a basic channel based on such a determination that the counterpart wireless communication apparatus receives the data through only one channel. At least based on the foregoing, Applicant submits that independent claim 1 is patentably distinguishable over Hwang and Jokinen, either alone or in combination.

Applicant amends independent claim 12 and submits that this claim is patentable at least based on reasons similar to those set forth above with respect to claim 1. Claim 24 is patentable at least based on reasons similar to those set forth above with respect to claim 1. Applicant submits that dependent claims 2, 4, 13 and 15 are patentable at least by virtue of their respective dependencies.

Further, with respect to dependent claims 2 and 13, Applicant previously argued that Hwang does not teach or suggest at least, “when the counterpart wireless communication apparatus receives the data through a plurality of frequency channels, the controller transmits the data through the plurality of frequency channels to the counterpart wireless communication

apparatus," as recited in claim 2 and similarly recited in claim 13. The Examiner never even responds to this particular argument. Applicant maintains that claims 2 and 13 are patentable over the applied references.

With respect to independent claim 6, Applicant previously argued that Hwang does not teach or suggest at least, "a controller for dividing the data for transmission by a number of frequency channels, and processing to transmit the data to a counterpart wireless communication apparatus intended to communicate with," as recited in claim 6. Again, the Examiner does not respond to this previously submitted argument, and Applicant maintains that claim 6 is patentably distinguishable over the applied references.

Applicant submits that independent claim 17 is patentable for reasons similar to those set forth above with respect to claim 6.

Applicant submits that dependent claims 7, 18, and 21 are patentable at least by virtue of their respective dependencies.

§103(a) Rejections (Hwang/ Jokinen / Rune) - Claims 3, 10, 14 and 23

The Examiner rejects claims 3, 10, 14 and 23 over the combination of Hwang, Jokinen, and Rune essentially for the same reasons set forth in the previous Office Action.

First, Applicant submits that dependent claims 3, 10 and 14 are patentable at least by virtue of their respective dependencies. Rune does not make up for the deficiencies of Hwang and Jokinen. Further, Applicant maintains the arguments set forth in the previous Responses, as the Examiner does not respond to these previous arguments. Therefore, at least based on the

foregoing and the arguments set forth in the Responses dated August 18, 2005 and December 10, 2004, Applicant maintains that claims 3, 10 and 14 are allowable over the applied references, either alone or in combination.

With respect to independent claim 23, Applicant maintains that this claim is patentable at least based on the reasons set forth in the Response dated August 18, 2005. Rune does not make up for the deficiencies of Hwang and Jokinen.

§103(a) Rejections (Hwang / Jokinen / Bluetooth Specifications) - Claims 5, 8, 16 and 19

Applicant submits that dependent claims 5, 8, 16 and 19 are patentable at least by virtue of their dependencies from independent claims 1, 6, 12, and 17, respectively. The Bluetooth Specifications fails to make up for the deficiencies of Hwang and Jokinen.

§103(a) Rejections (Hwang / Jokinen / Rinchiuso) - Claims 9 and 20

Applicant submits that dependent claims 9 and 20 are patentable at least by virtue of their respective dependencies from claims 6 and 17. Rinchiuso does not make up for the deficiencies of Hwang and Jokinen.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111  
U.S. Appln. No.: 10/003,417

Atty. Docket No. Q65283

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.


Respectfully submitted,

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

**23373**

CUSTOMER NUMBER

  
Diallo T. Crenshaw  
Registration No. 52,778

Date: May 1, 2006 (April 30, 2006 falling on a weekend)